49

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI S.R. NAYAK, CJ

Writ Petition No. 1772 of 1998

PETITIONERS

1. Mahangu aged 58 years s/o Budga Satnami
2. Girdhari alia Girdhar aged 55 years s/o Budga Satnami
3. Koli aged 52 years s/o Budga Satnami
4. Mansaram s/o Budga Satnami aged 48 years

all residents of Village Gharghoda, Tah. Gharghoda Dist. Raigarh.

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of M.P. through Secretary, Revenue Department, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal.
2. The Collector, Raigarh, Dist. Raigarh M.P.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer (Civil), Gharghoda, Dist. Raigarh M.P.
4. Lahorabai widow of Dhansai Uranv
5. Lalsai s/o Dhansai Uranv
6. Lal Singh s/o Dhansai Uranv
7. Dilsai s/o Dhansai Uranv
8. Botsai s/o Dhansai Uranv

respondents no. 4 to 8 all residents of Village Gharghoda, Tah. Gharghoda, Dist. Raigarh.

Present: Shri P. Diwakar, learned Sr. Advocate with Shri Adil Minhaj, learned counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Sanjay S. Agrawal, learned G.A. for the State/respondents 1, 2 & 3.
Shri H.S. Ahluwalia, learned counsel for the respondents 4 to 8.

ORAL ORDER

(Passed on 22nd June, 2006)

Against the order of the Sub Divisional Officer dated 23.2.98 (Annexure A/3) impugned in this writ petition, an appeal lies to the jurisdictional Collector under Section 44 of the Chhattisgarh Land Revenue Code 1959 (for short "the Code").

2. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I do not find any extraordinary situation or circumstance which could persuade the Court to permit the petitioner straightaway to rush to this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution without exhausting alternative, effective, comprehensive legal remedies provided under the Code. It needs to be noticed that not only an appeal lies against the impugned order under Section 44 of the Code, the petitioner can also further avail legal remedy by way of a revision to the Board of Revenue under Section 50 of the Code. Above all, the dispute brought before the Court, among legal questions, would also involve factual controversies. Such factual controversies cannot be resolved in a summary proceeding under Article 226 of the Constitution. Looking from any angle, this is not a fit case to be undertaken for adjudication under Article 226 of the Constitution. In that view of the matter, I dismiss the writ petition, however, reserving liberty to the petitioner to avail of appeal remedy provided under Section 44 of the Code. It is directed that if the petitioner files an appeal within a period of one month from today, the jurisdictional Collector is directed to dispose of such appeal on merit, in accordance with law, without reference to the limitation. The interim order passed by this Court shall remain in force for

51

a period of six weeks from today. It is open for the petitioner to move appropriate application before the Collector for interim order/s. No costs.

Sd/-
Chief Justice